

REMARKS

A new Figure has been added without introducing new matter.

Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic interview was conducted on January 28 and March 30, 2010 with Examiner Rao. Proposed amendments to independent claims were discussed. No agreement was reached as a result of these interviews.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 33-35, 3-11, 14-22, 25-27 and 29-32 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Mamiya et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,322) (hereafter Mamiya) in view of AAPA (Applicant Applied Prior Art). Claims 10-11, 21-22 and 32 are canceled without prejudice. Applicant respectfully traverses the remainder of the rejections in view of the following.

Independent Claim 33 recites a light reflecting material disposed between the backlight device and the low power reflective-type display, as claimed.

In contrast, Mamiya discloses a backlight device with a reflecting sheet at the bottom of the backlight device (see Mamiya, Figure 6, element 108). Film layers are disposed at the bottom of a light guide and the light guide is positioned over a polarizing plate which is further disposed over the reflecting sheet (see Mamiya, Figure 6, elements 104, 4, 6, 116, and 108). Accordingly, the reflecting sheet is at the bottom of the backlight device, as disclosed by Mamiya. As such,

Mamiya fails to teach or suggest a light reflecting material disposed between the backlight device and the low power reflective-type display, as claimed.

AAPA fails to remedy the failures of Mamiya with respect to the limitations of independent Claim 33 that were discussed above. Accordingly, Mamiya alone or in combination with AAPA fails to render independent Claim 33 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

Independent Claim 34 recites:

“a light reflecting film comprising at least one reflective pyramid shaped microstructure, wherein said light reflecting film is atop said transparent sheet, wherein said light reflecting film passes a first portion of said light received from said low power reflective-type display via said transparent sheet, and wherein said light reflecting film reflects a second portion of said light back to said low power reflective-type display to be recycled for subsequently passing through said light reflecting film,” as claimed.

As presented above, the top portion of the backlight device, as disclosed by Mamiya is the light guide. Thus, Mamiya fails to teach or suggest a light reflecting film including at least one reflective pyramid shaped microstructure, wherein the light reflecting film is atop the transparent sheet, as claimed.

Moreover, Mamiya alone or in combination with AAPA fails to teach or suggest that the light reflecting film passes a first portion of the light received from the low power reflective-type display via the transparent sheet, and wherein the light reflecting film reflects a second portion of the light back to the low power reflective-type display to be recycled for subsequently passing through the light

reflecting film, as claimed. The recited limitations describe the functionality of the light reflecting film, thereby further limiting the structure of the light reflecting film, as claimed.

Accordingly, Mamiya alone or in combination with AAPA fails to render independent Claim 34 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

Independent Claim 35 recites that:

“a brightness enhancing film (BEF) located between said backlight device and said low power reflective-type display, wherein microstructures at a bottom portion of said BEF concentrates light toward said plurality of light conducting spacers and directs light away from portions of said low power reflective-type display without said plurality of light conducting spacers,” as claimed.

In contrast, Mamiya discloses a $\lambda/4$ plate and a reflecting plate that are disposed adjacent to a light guide and a backlight device (see Mamiya, Figure 6, elements 124, 126, 104, 116, and 108). Accordingly, Mamiya fails to teach or suggest a brightness enhancing film (BEF) located between the backlight device and the low power reflective-type display, as claimed.

Moreover, Mamiya alone or in combination with AAPA fails to teach or suggest that the microstructures at a bottom portion of the BEF concentrates light toward the plurality of light conducting spacers and directs light away from portions of the low power reflective-type display without the plurality of light conducting spacers, as claimed. The recited limitations describe the functionality of the BEF, thereby further limiting the structure of the BEF, as claimed.

Accordingly, Mamiya alone or in combination with AAPA fails to render independent Claim 35 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

As such, allowance of Claims 33-35, 3-9, 14-20, 25-27 and 29-31 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims 3-11, 14-22, 25-27 and 29-35 is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 33-35, 3-9, 14-20, 25-27 and 29-31 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 33-35, 3-9, 14-20, 25-27 and 29-31 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 3-30-2010

/Amir A. Tabarrok/
Amir A. Tabarrok
Registration No. 57,137

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile